



EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTENSIS

★
5
738

EUROPEAN
SECURITY
and
PEKING'S
INTRIGUES

*Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1973*

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Against the Current. Professor M. UKRAINTSEV, APN	7
China's European Policy. J. NEMES, <i>Népszabadság</i> The Road to International Security. V. MATVEYEV, <i>Izvestia</i>	17
Peking and Europe. D. SOKOLOV, <i>Rabotnichesko Delo</i> China and the European Conference. A. JANICKI, <i>Interpress</i>	23
On an Anti-Soviet Platform. J. MAZAL, <i>Rudé Pravo</i> Peking's Foreign Policy: Against Socialism and Peace, <i>Einheit</i>	27
The First Stage. Y. ZHUKOV, <i>Pravda</i>	32
	38
	42
	49

Introduction

Millions of people of good will learned with great satisfaction of the news of the first phase of the conference on security and cooperation in Europe, which closed in Helsinki in July 1973. It was a significant event promising favourable changes on the European continent. The Soviet draft of the General Declaration on the Fundamentals of European Security and the Principles of Relations Between States in Europe and a number of constructive proposals made by other countries which took part in the conference were an important contribution to the cause of peace and security of European nations and of all mankind.

The purpose of this major international undertaking is to ensure that Europe live in conditions of a stable peace and serve as an example of the successful implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states have played an important role in bringing about a relaxation of tensions and in creating a favourable climate in Europe. In striving for peace and international cooperation on the European continent they fulfil their sacred duty to one another and to all of mankind. The vigorous peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries is a guarantee for strengthening the tendency towards building international relations on peaceable principles,

a guarantee that this tendency will become the prevailing one in international relations.

The present collection of articles reflects the views of prominent Soviet and European political observers. The articles recreate the atmosphere in which the idea of holding a European conference on questions of security and cooperation took shape, gained strength and found its political implementation. They show the massive support of the European and world public for the positive steps taken by 33 European states, the USA and Canada. And at the same time they call attention to the danger presented by the aggressive, adventurist forces which, in pursuit of their egoistic and narrow nationalist interests, could start a new war and prevent the establishment of a permanent peace in Europe and throughout the world.

Against the Current

Professor M. UKRAINTSEV, APN

The radical changes on the international scene in recent years and the implementation of the Soviet Peace Programme vividly testify to the viability and the necessity of the principles of peaceful coexistence which provide the only sound basis for relations between states with different social systems.

The West European countries, the USA and Canada have all come to realize, if not simultaneously and not to the same extent, that the course of hostility and confrontation with regard to the socialist countries, if allowed to continue, would sooner or later lead to a tragic end. The striving for mutually advantageous cooperation and for the settlement of conflicts and issues by peaceful means has replaced the bankrupt concepts of the times of the cold war.

This situation has made possible a series of undertakings that have radically improved the climate in Europe and the world over. These include the treaties signed by the USSR, the Polish People's Republic, and the German Democratic Republic, with the Federal Republic of Germany based on the recognition of the inviolability of European borders; the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin, which eliminates a major source of tension; the expansion of Soviet-French coopera-

tion which sets an example of good-neighbourly relations between European countries; Leonid Brezhnev's visit to Bonn which consolidated the turn toward establishing normal relations and mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the FRG; the exchange of visits by Soviet and US leaders which has considerably improved relations between the two powers that had until recently been diametrically opposed on all key international issues.

The inviolability of the European borders that have taken shape after the Second World War has been confirmed; agreement has been reached to base the relations between the socialist countries and the Western states on the principles of peaceful coexistence, and measures have been drafted to ensure their economic, scientific and technical cooperation and joint efforts to protect the environment. One of the most significant developments has been the abandonment by the Western states of their policy of boycotting the German Democratic Republic. After many years they finally came to acknowledge the self-evident truth that European affairs cannot be properly conducted if the interests of the German Democratic Republic are disregarded or prejudiced.

The Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, signed during Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States, has been favourably received throughout the world. This is a major step towards reducing and finally removing the threat of a nuclear war and the establishment of a system of real guarantees of international security. The accession of other states to this agreement will further contribute to ensuring universal security and a lasting peace on earth.

The plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Com-

mittee held in April 1973, noted that conditions have been created for building a stable system of security and cooperation in Europe. It pointed in this connection to the importance of a successful all-European conference.

The current development of peaceful relations and mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the one hand, and the Western states on the other, is a convincing practical confirmation of Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence. Lenin pointed out that the peaceful programme and long-term plans of economic cooperation between the Soviet republic and capitalist states not only met the interests of the absolute majority of the world's population but also attracted the attention of the business circles in capitalist countries. "With our plan we shall most certainly attract the sympathy, not only of all the workers but of sensible capitalists as well,"¹ he said.

The Soviet Union came to the conference on security and cooperation in Europe wishing to make it a success. For the USSR this was consistent with the policy in defence of peace which it has been pursuing in Europe and the world together with its allies and friends. This is one of the main directions outlined in the Peace Programme advanced by the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In his speech at the conference on July 3, 1973, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko pointed out that Europe's past and present-day realities in Europe indicate the basis on which the policy of European states should be built if they were to avoid conflicts and live in peace.

¹ Lenin. *Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 451.

This consists in the unconditional recognition of the principle of inviolability of frontiers;

sovereign equality;

refraining from the threat or use of force, the outlawing of war as a means of settling international disputes;

recognition of the territorial integrity of all European states with their present borders;

peaceful settlement of international disputes;

non-interference in domestic affairs, which means respect for the political, economic and cultural foundations of other states;

respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of religious belief;

equality of peoples and their right to decide their destinies for themselves, and to establish the social system and choose the form of government which they believe necessary;

cooperation between states to preserve international peace and security and establishment of reciprocal ties in the economic, cultural and other fields on the basis of sovereign equality of states and non-interference in internal affairs;

fulfilment in good faith of obligations under international law.

These principles of cooperation have been confirmed by life itself, and they take into account the views and wishes of the parties concerned.

The Soviet programme of ensuring peace and security on the European continent provided a constructive basis for the work of the all-European conference, and it has been favourably received by broad sections of the European and world public.

At the same time the European conference met with violent opposition from the cold war advocates and various types of revenge-seekers. The lou-

dest voice in the chorus of opponents of the European conference, however, is that of Peking which, incidentally, is located quite far from Europe.

How does one explain the fact that China led the attack of the reactionary and revenge-seeking forces against the conference on European security and cooperation? To answer this question one should first take a look at the overall foreign-policy strategy of the present Chinese leaders.

The foreign policy of the People's Republic of China has undergone a number of changes in the last 15 years or so. Sometimes it was aggressive; at other times it was relatively quiet. The Chinese leaders had talked about the "advantages" of the cold war, and had also spoken in favour of peaceful coexistence; they had called for a "cultural revolution" in all countries, and had promised not to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations; sometimes they shrieked, and at other times they spoke in unctuous tones. However, it was only the manner that changed, for the strategic aims of the Peking leaders have remained the same.

Underlying the policy of the Chinese leaders is an inflated notion of China's special mission, "Sinocentrism," which places China in the centre of all international relations. Mao Tse-tung had once claimed, in vain, leadership in the socialist community and in the world communist movement. In their attempt to dominate the national-liberation movement the Chinese leaders had played upon the notions of "common destiny" of China and Asian, African and Latin American countries and the unique value of China's experience for them and they once again failed. Then the Maoists invented the "monopoly of two superpowers" against which "all small and medium-

sized nations" should be united under China's leadership, but there were no volunteers to serve these great-power aspirations of Peking. In recent years the Maoists have been calling China a "developing country" in an attempt to win the confidence of the "third world" countries, but the 27th session of the UN General Assembly showed that the newly independent states had seen through Peking's designs.

A nuclear war between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, would be, in Mao's view, the surest way for China to achieve world domination. Nuclear war should not be feared, Mao Tse-tung said in his talk with a Soviet representative in September 1958. "The USSR and the USA now have nuclear bombs," he went on. "In the event of war these states would drop their nuclear bombs on each other. This war would probably affect China which would thus lose some three hundred million people. But China would still have four hundred million who would destroy the remnants of imperialism with sticks and establish socialism the world over."

The Chinese leaders have refused to accede to any of the international agreements aimed at checking the arms drive and easing tension. That is why they have so violently opposed the Soviet proposal on prohibiting the use of force in international relations and banning nuclear weapons for all times. That is also why they welcome any movement towards war and at the same time do all they can to foil every step towards peace.

Well known, for instance, is the stand taken by the Chinese leaders on the Middle East conflict. They strenuously spread the myth of the "collusion of the two superpowers," oppose the UN decisions on the Middle East and call for taking up

arms. Are the Maoists worried over the fate of the Arabs? The truth of the matter is that Peking believes that another war in the Middle East would seriously aggravate the world situation and would bring about, if not a conflict, at least a confrontation between the great powers.

Improvement of relations with the Western powers and Japan, which has been Peking's object in recent years, also serves China's great-power interests. Peking wants to have more opportunities of influencing the policy of these countries and also to obtain their scientific and technical know-how. Some people in the West believe that China's belligerence and intractability are explained by her present weakness in the military and economic fields and that they will disappear with time. There are others who clearly hope to benefit from the anti-Sovietism which is so zealously propagated by the Maoists.

China's attitude towards the European conference is in full accord with the basic foreign policy of the Peking leaders.

Europe was the scene of two world wars within the first half of this century. Should a third war begin, the Maoists reason, the white nations would destroy one another, and this would promote the hegemonic designs of Mao and his associates.

Renunciation of the use of force in relations between countries and the readiness to settle all outstanding issues by peaceful means would greatly reduce the danger of military conflicts. But this runs counter to the plans of Mao and his group. The confirmation of the inviolability of the European borders deprives the revenge-seekers of one of their trump cards, and this is definitely not to the liking of the Chinese leaders. China is the

only country in the world which has territorial claims against nearly all of its neighbours—the USSR, the Mongolian People's Republic, India, Laos, Vietnam, the Philippines and Japan. Peking seeks to set European nations against one another by turning their attention to the "territorial question" and calling on them to reconsider the post-war borders in Europe.

Agreement among the European countries, the USA and Canada to broaden economic cooperation and contacts in all fields will further strengthen trust among states and will crush the Maoists' hope of provoking conflicts and enmity between European countries.

Foreign-policy strategists in Peking had regarded as their most important task that of undermining the European conference. They openly demanded that the Western states oppose the conference. Chinese propaganda presented the initiative of the socialist countries as an attempt to "knock together a counter-revolutionary alliance, to suppress the revolutionary movement in Europe and to stabilize the order in capitalist countries." In an attempt to hinder the conference the Maoists sought to prevent the ratification of the FRG's treaties with the USSR and the Polish People's Republic and attacked the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin. They asserted that detente would enable the Soviet Union to concentrate larger forces against China, though it is perfectly clear that if the Chinese leaders really believed in the "threat from the North" they would not have rejected the Soviet proposal to sign a USSR-PRC agreement on refraining from the use of force or blocked the talks on border questions.

When Peking saw that the European conference

would definitely take place they sought to sow mistrust against the USSR among the Western countries and to prevent the successful holding of the conference. Posing as friends and "sage counsellors" they warned against Moscow's "perfidy" and the danger of a "collusion of the two superpowers" at Europe's expense. "Beware lest the all-European conference on security turn into a conference to subvert security!", declared Chiao Kuan-hua, the Chinese representative at the United Nations. According to Peking, instead of negotiating agreements on detente the West European countries should strengthen NATO and expand the Common Market in order to stand up to the Warsaw alliance and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

The numerous high-ranking visitors from Europe invariably had to listen to such stereotyped arguments and warnings from Chou En-lai and other Chinese leaders who asserted that the conference was a dangerous and harmful venture. When this did not help the Chinese leaders sent Foreign Minister Chi Peng-fei on a tour of Europe in June 1973.

Most European political commentators believed that Peking regarded the further improvement of the Soviet Union's relations with Western countries, detente in Europe and a possible reduction of armed forces on the European continent as running counter to Peking's policy and thus tried to find allies among some of the European governments in an effort to stop these trends and processes.

Chi Peng-fei made clear the Chinese attitude to "European construction" when he officially declared that Peking supported "the efforts of the West European countries to achieve unity on the

basis of equality and mutual advantage." He spoke of China's wish to see Western Europe "keep its distance with regard to the Soviet Union."

Since Peking had failed in its attempts to foil the conference on security and cooperation in Europe, "heavy artillery" was brought into action against detente and the European conference at the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of China which was held in secret in late August 1973. Chou En-lai declared at the congress that "detente is a transitory phenomenon," while "colossal upheavals" lie ahead. By colossal upheavals, as is known, Peking means a world war. Chou En-lai also asserted that the West is intent on turning the USSR to face the East so that it would be quiet in the West. Here again the Chinese leaders acted in their characteristic manner. First they threatened the West European governments, then tried to persuade them. Now that they failed to impose their position on these governments they resort to accusations.

Developments show that the Chinese leaders have clearly overestimated Peking's influence on world developments, and that no government would wish to establish close relations with the PRC on the basis of outright anti-Sovietism and adventurism.

The conference on questions of security and cooperation in Europe is yet another proof of that the Chinese leaders' adventurist policy has no future. The prevailing trends in today's world are those of improving the international situation and expanding cooperation between nations. Any effort to oppose these trends is doomed to failure.

China's European Policy

Janos NEMES

Playing the role of "patrons" of the "third world" the Chinese leaders had for many years paid little attention to Europe. Though they never missed a chance of sowing distrust of Soviet proposals on normalizing the situation on the continent, they had generally kept away from the political clashes in Europe. Recent events have shown, however, that the Peking authorities are seeking to exert influence in Europe and establish new contacts, and are more open than previously in rejecting or supporting certain efforts.

This sudden interest in European affairs did not pass unnoticed by the European press. The Austrian newspaper *Die Presse*, a mouthpiece of the country's big bourgeoisie, noted not long ago: "Until recently the Chinese citizen somewhere in the hinterland has considered Albania to be the most loyal and certainly the most decent state in Europe. And then there suddenly appears the Federal Republic of Germany, and in that Federal Republic is a conservative opposition, and within it is one influential person, Schröder, whom the Chinese government has invited to visit China as a parliamentary leader."

The author of the article in *Die Presse* would be quite mistaken if he thought that such zig-zags would be regarded as unusual by the Chinese citizen. In fact the latter is almost a daily witness, or

rather, a victim of the most sudden and entirely inexplicable policy changes. Thus the government's manipulations in European affairs, if he has thought about it at all, are merely registered in his mind mechanically. But if he would take a closer look at the circumstances of Schröder's visit, it could help him form his view of his government's policy.

The fact that Schröder was invited to Peking and was treated with courtesy and attention there and that even Chou En-lai found time to exchange views with him is quite understandable since Schröder is a person of considerable influence in the FRG. But it was probably not clear to Schröder himself why he was allowed to make a trip to a military unit, an honour which had not been conferred on any other foreign visitor. But Schröder, a crafty politician, quickly realized that the trip was necessary not for him but for his hosts who wanted to tell the world through him that Lin Piao's disappearance had not caused the army to collapse.

It may be assumed with a measure of certainty that the invitation to Schröder had to do with the establishment of diplomatic relations between the PRC and the FRG, though, from a practical standpoint, Schröder, who is one of the chief opponents of the present West German government, is hardly the best intermediary in such a matter. The average Chinese citizen is of course unaware that when the question of establishing diplomatic relations between the PRC and the FRG was first raised in 1964, Schröder, then the Foreign Minister, to put it mildly, showed no particular interest in reaching an agreement on this question.

For the Chinese leaders Schröder is only a chessman in a big strategic game in which the stake is

Europe. They have tried to use others, for example, French Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann, during his visit to Peking. They tried to undermine Soviet-French cooperation though how such cooperation could prejudice China's interests remains a mystery.

A few general remarks are in place here before we turn to the specific features of Peking's new European policy.

There is no doubt that China's interest in the European continent has grown. It is important for us to consider the extent and significance of this interest in a realistic manner.

What we are concerned about is not the fact that China has given up its protracted and in our view harmful self-isolation and has lately shown an interest in Europe. What we find disturbing is that China is seeking to help the forces of reaction which have lost ground owing to a relaxation of international tension. It is not clear to us why China chooses to ignore those forces in Europe and those people, Communists above all, that have been fighting, not just now and not for two decades, but much longer, in keeping with the most humanistic traditions, for a Europe that will never again become the scene of interstate conflicts.

Here mention should be made first of all of the Soviet-West German and the Polish-West German treaties, the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin, the agreements between the GDR and the FRG, and between the GDR and the West Berlin senate. Peking keeps attacking these important documents and goes so far as to say that the conclusion of these treaties and agreements is a "betrayal of the interests" of the GDR. Following this logic one may well conclude that the interests

of the GDR are best represented by Franz Josef Strauss and various revenge-seeking organizations which would not even want to know about the above-named agreements.

Another European question which China views with extreme prejudice is that of the European conference on security and cooperation. Here she stands together with the darkest forces of European reaction, the only difference being that these forces, being better acquainted with the situation on the continent, dare not express their hostile attitude openly. The absurdity of the Chinese stand is clearly seen if one asks: what is the alternative to a system of collective security in Europe? Should the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty watch each other, being fully armed, while the US strengthens its guardianship over Western Europe with the help of NATO? And, by analogy, should not the counterparts of NATO in other regions of the world—SEATO, CENTO, and other groupings which pose an immediate threat to China—be also built up? Is this what Peking wants?

It is well known that China has been showing an increasing interest in the expansion of the Common Market. Apart from the fact that it is rather strange for a state professing a socialist ideology to take a favourable stand with regard to a powerful economic association striving to build up the positions of monopoly capitalism, there is another striking circumstance. The socialist countries well remember the violent attacks of the Chinese against the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance which they regard as the embodiment of Soviet hegemony. It would seem then that socialist countries should not try to achieve unity and integration but build socialism each on its own, main-

taining a self-supported economy, while capitalist integration should proceed at a faster pace.

We Europeans who are familiar with the continent's complex problems are naturally not pleased when the important issues affecting us are looked upon as moves in a game of chess. This shows once again to what extremes of fanaticism an anti-Soviet policy may lead. It is quite clear that today's China sees capitalist Europe as a political, and NATO, as a military counterweight to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. This is well understood by the traditional anti-Soviet forces in Europe who have quickly picked up the tune of the new Chinese anti-Sovietism.

In its negotiations with its Western counterparts the Chinese leadership invariably seeks to create the impression that it is concerned with its security and that it fears a "Soviet offensive." It thus follows, according to the Chinese, that the containment of the Soviet Union in another area, above all in Europe, contributes to China's security.

Europeans and people in other parts of the world have been fed too long, in the cold war years, with the myth of a "Soviet threat" by capitalists, first of all by the USA and its allies, to swallow this bitter pill now in a "socialist" coating. China is threatened, not by the Soviet Union, which has no wish to conquer China, but by a common enemy—imperialism. We believe that this truth cannot be obliterated in the minds of the Chinese people either by anti-Soviet slander or by propaganda tricks.

As for European problems, we agree with the *Neue Rhein-Zeitung* which gave this warning to Peking and Mr. Schröder: "It should be kept in

mind that the key to lessening tension in Central Europe should be sought, not in Peking, but in Europe itself."

Népszabadság, August 10, 1972

The Road to International Security

Vikenti MATVEYEV

The meetings and talks between Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and President Georges Pompidou of France in Zaslavl, near Minsk, had met with a favourable response in Europe and elsewhere in the world. This is highly significant in that it shows once again the tremendous importance which the normal development of relations between the Soviet Union and France has for the general improvement of the political climate in Europe, which has been under way in the past several years.

It is logical and natural that the word "Minsk" is often being mentioned in the world press together with the word "Helsinki" where consultations of representatives of thirty-two countries of Europe, the United States and Canada have been resumed after a four-week recess. The aim of these consultations is to reach agreement in procedural and organizational matters in preparation for a European conference on security and cooperation.

As is known, Leonid Brezhnev and Georges Pompidou devoted great attention during their meeting to the situation in Europe. The convening of a European conference is at present undoubtedly the most important question in the context of Euro-

pean politics. There is every reason to believe that the multilateral preparatory consultations in Helsinki will soon result in an agreement that will make it possible to hold such a conference within the next few months.

The fact that the USSR and France have officially declared their readiness to do all they could to make the conference a success, and that they regard the European forum as a major political undertaking of world significance has already had a great impact on international affairs.

Foreign observers and politicians who, in pursuit of their selfish ends—and they alone know what they are—tried to create shadows on a bright day by spreading rumours about “deterioration” of relations between Paris and Moscow, now hold their tongues and are forced to admit that what they were saying had no substance.

Relaxation of tensions can be achieved and agreements can be reached provided certain difficulties are overcome, and this becomes particularly complex when representatives of many countries take part in the negotiations. The results of such negotiations depend on the energy and determination of the countries and governments interested in achieving detente.

Owing to the will and the activity of the governments interested in lessening tensions in Europe, definite progress has been made in this direction during 1971 and 1972. This has opened up before Europe new favourable prospects, new opportunities for safeguarding the continent from the danger of wars and military conflicts.

On January 15 and 16, 1973, the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty countries met in Moscow to discuss questions relating to European security.

With increasing frequency the year 1973 is being mentioned in the foreign press as the “year of Europe.” And indeed we can and should achieve still greater results in the current year in the field of cooperation between European countries, and make further joint efforts to transform the continent into a region of lasting peace. The European conference, preparations for which are now under way, will serve as a good start for further collective efforts that will benefit all the countries concerned.

The “year of Europe”—this expression in no way contradicts the fact that those who call for a basic improvement of Europe’s political climate are also for the recognition of the legitimate rights and interests of the peoples of Vietnam and the Arab East. In other words, concern for the destinies of peace in Europe has nothing in common with the notorious idea of “Eurocentrism” or “retreating into one’s shell.”

The world is not only indivisible; its various regions are closely interconnected.

Some people in the West appear to be alarmed over the fact that France and some other West European countries have disagreed with the United States over certain aspects of the latter’s foreign policy which have for some time been a source of international tension. Thus, an observer of *The Christian Science Monitor*, Joseph Harsh, writing about the weakening of the ties between Western Europe and the United States, did not conceal the fact that he was disturbed by this process and what it could mean to the positions of the United States in NATO.

The Peking leaders have made an open bid to prolong and deepen the split of Europe into opposing groupings. The object of their attention is

NATO, while the objects of their attacks and slander are those who are trying to strengthen peace in Europe. The West German newspaper *Die Welt* noted the dogged perseverance with which the leaders of the People's Republic of China had been expressing their "doubts" with regard to the convocation of a European conference.

The Peking leaders are not even trying to conceal their anti-Sovietism which blinds them to reality, and their reliance on NATO as a tool for maintaining tensions in Europe. But anti-Sovietism is rapidly losing whatever little attraction it still holds for some forces in the world. The West German newspaper *Handelsblatt*, recently indicated another reason for Peking's keen interest in NATO. It pointed out that Peking's negative and obstructionistic attitude with regard to urgent international issues had put the diplomacy of the People's Republic of China in a bad light, and that in its search for support Peking was trying to ingratiate itself with the most rabid reactionaries who, too, recoil in fear before the fresh, warm winds now blowing in the world.

According to a Chinese saying, if there is a road going forward, there is always a little path going backward.

The nations of Europe want to move forward, towards the new horizons of a peaceful future, and this desire is the motive force behind all the positive changes taking place on the continent.

Izvestia, January 17, 1973

Peking and Europe

Dimo SOKOLOV

A strange coincidence can be seen lately in international politics. Whenever there appears the least sign of relaxation of tensions, Peking emerges on the scene, armed with Maoist propaganda and diplomacy, trying to smear the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and block the constructive solution of political problems. What is strange, however, is not so much the coincidence itself as the purely nationalistic and chauvinistic ideology of the Chinese leadership, and its anti-Soviet and anti-socialist policy which is deeply hostile to the idea of peace and cooperation between nations.

Take, for example, Peking's attitude to European problems, notably the question of the convocation of a European conference and the question of strengthening security and cooperation on the continent. Two years ago Peking showed little interest in this part of the world. But things have changed. Today Peking's "concern" for Europe and its problems has grown immensely. Chinese officials and diplomats suddenly began talking about these problems at various international forums. More and more West European politicians and statesmen are visiting China, among them being those who cannot by any means be called friends of European security and cooperation. The

talks held between them and Peking leaders are widely publicized in China.

What could have prompted this interest? Could it be a desire to help solve such important international problems as European security? Could it be explained by the fact that the nations of our old continent now trust one another more than they did in the past? Or could it be a desire to uphold the interests of the European nations which want peace and understanding?

Nothing of the kind. China's activity is prompted by quite different motives, the dominant one being a malicious desire to frustrate the efforts aimed at solving the European problems, and to maintain, as far as possible, tensions in Europe and other parts of the world. And all this is being done in order to undermine the efforts of the Soviet Union, the socialist states and other peace-loving forces to carry out a truly important international project.

There are many enemies of European security and of the proposed European conference, and the most ferocious of them is Peking.

For example, at the 27th session of the UN General Assembly the head of China's delegation, Chiao Kuang-hua, declared that the purpose of the European conference proposed by the Warsaw Treaty countries was to promote "insecurity rather than security," and that the initiative of the Soviet Union and the socialist states would further aggravate tensions in Europe.

The Peking leaders are linking their hopes for achieving their nationalistic, anti-Soviet goals with the activities of militarist circles and the plans of reactionary forces throughout the world. They are spreading the absurd notion of "two super-powers," and are making venomous attacks on the Soviet

Union. They never miss a chance to vilify the Warsaw Treaty or to praise and whitewash the activities of the aggressive NATO block. *Jenmin jihpao* said recently that it was not the forces that support NATO, but the Warsaw Treaty countries that were responsible for the present tensions in Europe. This newspaper, the mouthpiece of the Peking leaders, goes even further. It tries to justify the military buildup of NATO by talking about the necessity of defending Europe against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in Europe. China's mass media and diplomacy repeated the allegations of the Israeli militarists and other anti-Soviet quarters about "Soviet expansion" in the Mediterranean. In doing so they play directly into the hands of those who are really responsible for the tensions and for the dangerous provocations in that area of the world. It was not surprising that the well-known American columnist Cyrus Sulzberger commented not without malice that Peking was becoming a secret champion of the 25-year old North Atlantic Alliance.

What is more, the Chinese leaders hold the same positions on questions of European security as the most reactionary quarters of Europe and the world, such enemies of peace and international cooperation as Franz Josef Strauss in West Germany. It may be recalled that during the last election campaign in West Germany this gentleman, who had openly voiced opposition to the ideas of European security, did his utmost to frighten the electorate with the bogey of a multinational state in Europe headed by the Soviet Union.

In some respects Peking is even more skilful than its West European confederates in spreading slander and misinformation. For example, the Chinese press is trying to frighten the credulous by

saying that the Helsinki meeting was nothing but a "stratagem" of Moscow which sought to expand the sphere of its influence in Western Europe. These obvious inventions differ little from statements by such Western politicians as Herr Schröder, the leader of the parliamentary opposition in West Germany, who speaks about the "fear in the face of Soviet domination in Europe," and his political supporter, R. Jaeger, who asserts that the "European conference serves the interests of the Russians only."

The Chinese pseudo-revolutionaries are trying to hinder the efforts aimed at reducing arms stockpiles on the European continent and are openly calling for maintaining them at their present high level; they are also calling for the buildup of the American military presence in Europe in order "to preserve international stability and peace." According to the London *Times* and the Paris *Information*, the Chinese voiced their opinion in conversations with British Foreign Secretary A. Douglas Home and West German Foreign Minister W. Scheel during their recent visits to Peking.

All this shows how far the Peking leaders have gone in their anti-socialist frenzy and how determined they are to disrupt the normal course of international relations. Their policy is in contradiction with the interests of peace, with the interests of all nations. In fact it runs counter to the interests of the Chinese people, too.

The strengthening of peace and security in Europe is imperative in our time. It is historical necessity. It would be difficult to turn the clock of history back to the time of the cold war and confrontation. Only the most reactionary, militarist quarters in Europe (and not only in Europe) still

think they can do that. And so do the Maoist leaders who have gone too far in their unbridled chauvinism and have abandoned Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Rabotnichesko Delo, April 23, 1973

China and the European Conference

Andrzej JANICKI

In a talk with a foreign newsman, Premier Chou En-lai recalled an old Chinese saying: "Distant water will not extinguish a nearby fire." Certainly there is not much one can say against this bit of folk wisdom. Then why are the Chinese leaders doing their utmost to have the evil spirit of tensions and the cold war again appear in Europe?

During the first decade of its existence and even in the early 60s, the PRC, on all the key European issues, including that of establishing a collective security system on the continent, took a similar stand to that of the socialist countries. At that time Peking voiced resolute support for the proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries for establishing peace and cooperation in Europe.

A statement signed by Mao Tse-tung on April 7, 1955, "On the Termination of the State of War With Germany," said among other things that "the People's Republic of China resolutely supports the struggle, currently being conducted by the German Democratic Republic, the entire German people, the Soviet Union and other countries striving for peace, for collective security in Europe and the preservation of world peace."

The Chinese-Polish Statement, signed by the Premiers of the two countries in Peking on

April 11, 1957, said, in part: "The two sides once again reaffirm that they support all efforts aimed at establishing a system of collective security that would guarantee peace for the countries of Europe and would lead to the elimination of the groupings in confrontation. . . , and take a stand in accordance with which all the military blocks in confrontation must give way to a system of collective security. The two sides will make every effort to set up a durable system of collective security."

In the mid-'60s, the Chinese leaders made a political *volte-face*, adopting anti-socialist positions for the sake of their great-power goals. Striving to become the leader of the "third world," Peking has disavowed its former positions and is no longer for stabilization and peaceful cooperation in Europe. It prefers military confrontation in Europe, and the preservation of tensions between the two world systems, especially between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It is in this situation that Peking now considers it possible to pursue its great-power policy in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In an editorial commenting on the results of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Karlovy Vary, *Jenmin jihpao* (May 4, 1967) subjected to fierce attacks the "Declaration on Peace and Security in Europe." The principles which had formerly been supported by the Chinese leaders were now described as a "betrayal of the interests of the working class in Europe" and an "attempt to set up an anti-Chinese, anti-communist, and anti-national alliance."

If one disregards the verbal excesses, one can easily understand the irritation of the Peking leaders. The document signed in Karlovy Vary marked the beginning of the practical implemen-

tation of the ideas of security and cooperation in Europe, and the settlement of issues that had barred the way to the attainment of the set goal.

In attacking the idea of establishing a European security system, Peking levelled its main blow at a major principle on the basis of which alone can the edifice of a lasting peace in Europe be erected: the principle of inviolability of the existing frontiers.

Here it should be noted that the first steps in that direction were taken by Peking in the early '60s. During a meeting with a group of Japanese Socialists in July 1964, Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the CPC Central Committee apart from making fantastic territorial claims against the Soviet Union, tried to artificially stir up the long settled problem of European frontiers. Peking repeatedly went back to the frontier issues in the years that followed, especially after the "cultural revolution."

All this was reflected in the sharp criticism made by the Chinese leaders of the treaties concluded by the USSR and the FRG and by the Polish People's Republic and the FRG.

In a talk with newsmen from Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland, on November 10, 1972, Premier Chou En-lai urged the governments of these countries to make territorial claims against the Soviet Union.

In late autumn 1969, Li Hsien-nien, Vice-Premier of the PRC, on a visit to Albania, made a series of attacks against the plan for convening an all-European conference, describing this plan as "an attempt to divide the spheres of influence in Europe in order to control and oppress Eastern Europe."

The violent campaign conducted by the Chinese press against the ideas of European security con-

tinues. In 1972, Premier Chou En-lai spared no effort in an attempt to convince his guests from Western countries that "the conference is premature," that it "is fraught with a serious danger for the West," that "in China's opinion, it would be much better not to hold the European forum at all."

But in spite of Peking's hostile activities, the consistent and patient efforts of the socialist countries to establish a system of security and cooperation in Europe are winning increasing support of all the countries of our continent. In this situation the leaders of China realize that the further pursuit of an extremely negative policy with regard to the All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation, and attempts to impede the process of detente can lead to the isolation of the PRC and render difficult the conduct of her foreign policies.

The positive results achieved at the meetings in Helsinki have compelled the Chinese leaders once again to alter their tactics and still further camouflage their real aims.

What are the characteristic features of Peking's "new tactics"? They consist in the use of various trends and tendencies to divert attention from vital problems, to create artificial obstacles, to lay down new conditions and to ultimately utilize the European conference to weaken the unity of the socialist states.

Peking's "new stand" can be seen, for example, from an article published in *Jenmin jihpao* on December 17, 1972. The article is an attempt to set certain European states, particularly the socialist countries, against one another. It said that at the European conference there should be discussed as many problems as possible, and especially those concerning which different opinions existed.

The same newspaper, in an article published in its April 6, 1973 issue, says in part: "Can we talk about security and European cooperation in general, without discussing the question of the security of the Mediterranean?" But the insincerity of this statement can readily be perceived if we recall that Peking is doing everything it can to prevent the resolving of the conflict in the Middle East, and that it approves the presence of the NATO navy in the Mediterranean.

What lies behind Peking's stand with regard to the basic issues of security on the European continent?

First, Peking is aiming at weakening the USSR and the socialist community which, according to the Chinese leaders, is the main barrier to the implementation of the great-power plans of the "middle state."

Secondly, Peking, quite understandably, pins its hopes on Europe's most reactionary quarters since these are hostile to the socialist countries and would therefore like to see the buildup of the military and economic potential of an anti-Soviet China.

Thirdly, a state of confrontation and tensions on our continent will provide, according to the Chinese leaders, the best conditions for the strengthening of Peking's influence in Asia.

Fourthly, the establishment of a system of collective security and cooperation in Europe would become an important factor in accelerating the process of setting up a system of collective security in Asia—something which the Peking leaders are so afraid of, which they regard as an obstacle to the implementation of their hegemonistic plans.

Thus, Peking's stand with regard to the Euro-

pean conference is just another confirmation of that old Chinese proverb: "The snake does not change its treacherous nature even when it hides itself in a straight bamboo shoot."

Interpress

On an Anti-Soviet Platform

J. MAZAL

The last few months have brought new convincing proof of the fact that struggle against the socialist community, open sabotage against the efforts to halt the arms buildup and ease world tension, and unprincipled collusion with the world's most reactionary forces on an anti-Soviet platform, have become a permanent and an essential part of the foreign policy conducted by the present leadership of the People's Republic of China. Its attitude to the key problems of present-day Europe also fully confirms this fact.

What lies behind such position? What are Peking's global aims? The establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the countries of Western Europe is in principle a good thing. It is common knowledge that practically from the very first day of the existence of the People's Republic of China, it was the socialist countries, and first of all the Soviet Union, that had consistently upheld its right to full international recognition and representation in the United Nations.

However, the PRC leadership uses its rapprochement with capitalist countries to pursue unworthy ends, and takes actions which are against the vital interests of the socialist countries and the aspirations of peace-loving people in Europe. The PRC is opposed to the easing of world tension and the

achievement of lasting peace on the European continent.

One of the tactical moves undertaken by the PRC as it increases its diplomatic activity in Western Europe is to create mistrust and anxiety in the relations between the European states and in this way weaken the political role of the USSR and other socialist countries.

Chinese diplomacy has been using all the available channels to undermine the initiative of the socialist countries to convene an All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation.

"We Chinese are against this idea," said General Huang Chen, the head of the Chinese mission in Paris. The Chinese mass media are carrying on savage attacks against all the constructive proposals put forward by representatives of the USSR and other socialist countries in the interests of European security. Premier Chou En-lai and representatives of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs spare no effort to convince other states of their negative attitude to any negotiations in Europe on security and cooperation. This was the case when such West European politicians as M. Schumann (France), W. Scheel (FRG), A. Douglas Home (Britain) and G. Medici (Italy) visited China during 1972 and 1973. The Chinese leaders did not mince matters in their attempt to convince these politicians of the "socialist countries' insincerity" which, they said, made these countries "untrustworthy." The Chinese also played on such a catchphrase of the cold-war period as the "Soviet menace to the peoples of Western Europe."

In his talk with the West German Christian Democrat, G. Schröder, Premier Chou En-lai made it plain that it would be a good thing if the all-European conference did not take place at all.

Such is the position of the official representatives of the PRC with regard to the all-European conference. This position is being fully supported by the most reactionary political forces in Western Europe, NATO military circles, and politicians directly involved in the arms race and connected with the military-industrial complexes in Western Europe.

The PRC leaders and the ultra-Right politicians in the FRG hold a similar position with regard to the agreements between the USSR and the FRG, and the Polish People's Republic and the FRG, which have become important milestones on the road to achieving understanding between European states.

Jenmin jihpao has called the USSR-FRG agreement a "betrayal of the German people's interests," an act which allegedly promotes West German militarism.

The struggle to halt the arms buildup, both nuclear and conventional, and to achieve complete and universal disarmament, which is the prime strategic goal of the joint efforts of the socialist states in the foreign policy field, is characterized by the Chinese leaders as an "imperialist plot."

The Peking leaders are also categorically opposed to the idea of holding a World Conference on Disarmament and conducting effective negotiations to limit the production and buildup of several types of weapons and their testing.

The PRC leaders have not signed the 1963 treaty on the banning of nuclear tests and other agreements on disarmament which have been signed by dozens of states.

In their talks with representatives of Western states the Chinese leaders repeatedly warned of

the "danger to these countries which a reduction of their troops in Europe would entail."

Time and again Chinese diplomats have made it plain to the leaders of the Common Market countries that China would have no objections to the formation of independent West-European "rocket-nuclear" forces. In keeping with their strategic conceptions they welcome processes promoting the economic and political integration of Western Europe, describing it as "a counter-balance to the USSR and other states of the socialist community in Europe."

Rabid anti-Sovietism is a main and permanent feature of China's activities in Europe. Their aim is to do as much harm as possible to the USSR and the socialist community, and to hinder concerted efforts to strengthen peaceful relations between Eastern and Western Europe.

"Peking wants the same thing that we do," said the Right-wing West German daily *Bonner Rundschau* in describing the PRC's European policy, "and that is the presence of US troops in Europe, a strong NATO bloc and an even more united European Economic Community."

It is no wonder that the Chinese leaders with their anti-Soviet stand have found supporters and allies among the most reactionary political forces. They are united by hatred and enmity towards the entire socialist community which the Maoist leadership regards as the chief obstacle to the implementation of its great-power schemes.

Rudé Pravo, May 23, 1973

Peking's Foreign Policy: Against Socialism and Peace

The current foreign-policy course of the People's Republic of China is marked by a sharp turn to the right. This is manifested in the open transition on the part of the Peking leaders to a policy strictly directed against the socialist countries and the world communist movement, against the Peace Programme advanced by the 24th CPSU Congress and the anti-imperialist platform adopted by the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969, and in the fact that the Peking leaders are increasingly basing their policy on collusion with the chief imperialist powers.

The desire to preserve and aggravate international tension is reflected in all the main speeches of the Chinese representatives to the 27th session of the UN General Assembly. To this day the current Chinese leadership has not signed a single treaty on disarmament. The Chinese leaders sabotage and distort all the proposals advanced by the USSR and other socialist countries aimed at achieving disarmament and a relaxation of tensions, and at ensuring peace and eliminating the existing hotbeds of conflicts. Acting together with imperialism, they place obstacles in the path of preparations for a world disarmament conference. They make territorial claims against the Soviet Union, and stir up anti-Soviet military hysteria in the

country, while at the same time refusing to sign the treaty proposed by the Soviet Union on the non-use of force, including nuclear weapons.

While the socialist countries, united around the Soviet Union, are waging a struggle to achieve world detente, the Chinese leaders are resorting to new means and methods for setting some countries against others, thus continuing to aggravate tensions in South Asia and in the Middle East. They support the revanchist attitudes of certain circles in the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, take a favourable stand on the question of the speedy arming of Japan, and increase their efforts, together with the conservative forces in Britain and the reactionary forces grouped around Strauss and Schröder in the FRG, to hamper the successful holding of the All-European Conference on Security and Cooperation.

The PRC's current foreign policy essentially represents a great-power, chauvinistic, negative reaction of the Peking leaders to the positive changes taking place in the world. This policy consists in a long-range attempt to counteract in every possible way the efforts of the USSR and of the fraternal socialist countries allied with it to implement the principles of peaceful coexistence in the relations between the two world systems. Peking's foreign policy is a logical outcome of the great-power, chauvinist and hegemonic course, which the Chinese leaders have persistently conducted.

The Chinese leadership is waging an especially fierce struggle against the concerted foreign policy of the socialist community aimed at implementing the principles of peaceful coexistence, against the ensurance of peace and cooperation in Europe, Asia and other parts of the world. The signs of relaxation of tension that have appeared and the

steps that have been taken towards establishing a stable system of security and cooperation in Europe are deeply disturbing to the Chinese leaders who see in them a big obstacle to the attainment of their great-power, chauvinistic aims, who fear that such developments would further reduce the scope of their policy of aggravating international tension.

The Chinese leaders' current European policy pursues the aim of forming an alliance with all the anti-communist forces opposed to a relaxation of tension and thus preventing a basic turn towards a stable peace in Europe and reviving the cold-war atmosphere on this continent. Herein lies the essence of this policy, which is dangerous and adventuristic. Guided by their selfish, great-power, chauvinistic interests, the Chinese leaders are conducting a European policy the chief aim of which is to weaken the socialist community, the latter being the most active and powerful force today aiding the process of detente. This clearly shows that violent anti-Sovietism is the basis of the anti-socialist policy conducted by the present-day leaders of the PRC, which is against the interests of all socialist fraternal countries.

The Peking leaders would like, first of all, to prevent the relaxation of tension in Europe from turning into a process that enhances the prestige of the USSR and the whole socialist community and promotes the setting up of a system of collective security in Asia, for the Chinese leaders are putting up a determined resistance to the establishment of a system of collective security proposed by the Soviet Union.

The European policy of the Chinese leaders is at the same time directed against the democratic and workers' movements in the capitalist states,

against the interests of the working people in the struggle against international monopoly capital, and in the struggle for peace. In their divisive activities directed against the international communist movement in Western Europe, the Peking leaders have shifted their emphasis by waging a struggle against the programme for united action of all the anti-imperialist forces drawn up by the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969. They are trying to push the Communist and Workers' Parties fighting against Peking's divisive course onto a "neutral" course and thereby weaken the unity and lessen the militancy of the international communist movement and of all anti-imperialist forces. Simultaneously the Peking leaders are directing the Maoist dissident groups in the West-European capitalist countries, though less openly than before, to ally themselves with all the anti-socialist and anti-Soviet forces, including the more reactionary circles.

The Chinese leaders' changeover to an open struggle against the Peace Programme of the socialist community and to a rapprochement on that basis with certain forces in the main imperialist countries gives encouragement primarily to the conservative imperialist circles that have not given up the idea of turning back the clock of history. In practice the anti-socialist policy pursued by the reactionary imperialist circles and that followed by the Maoist leaders have several common features: a struggle against the growing influence of the USSR and the entire socialist community; an attempt to establish anew the spheres of influence; some of their economic interests coincide—the Chinese leaders want to develop their military-industrial base, while the imperialist circles are trying to grab the Chinese market; they also seek

to split the revolutionary forces; and actively utilize nationalistic sentiments for their selfish purposes.

Maoist ideology and practice are based on an unprincipled exploitation of the revolutionary factors of social development. They ignore the elements of socialist relations existing in China, and in this lies the danger of Maoism. The Peking leaders are at the same time trying to attain their aims by securing a dominant position over the anti-imperialist forces and movements so as to make use of them in the pursuit of their own great-power policy. In waging a struggle against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, the Chinese leaders hope to weaken a force which is the main obstacle to the realization of their great-power ambitions, a force whose internationalist policy and ideological influence have shown up the anti-socialist essence of Maoism. This explains their determined dissociation from scientific socialism and its implementation in the USSR. At the same time they are trying, with the help of the slogan of the alleged "danger from the North," to alleviate the hidden crisis of Maoism, to divert attention from domestic difficulties, achieve internal unity and crush the opposition forces. Finally, they are trying to bargain for broader political and economic support of the imperialist states through brazen, aggressive anti-Sovietism.

The plans of the Chinese leaders also call for weakening the alliance between the USSR and all the other revolutionary forces, for presenting the struggle against the position of the Chinese leadership as a conflict between China and the Soviet Union, and for strengthening the neutralist and nationalistic trends in the world revolutionary movement, for the Chinese leaders wish to conceal the fact that anti-Sovietism of all hues is a va-

riant of anti-communism, which is essentially anti-socialist and is directed against the interests of all socialist states and all revolutionary forces.

The Peking leadership is still advancing slogans against imperialism and against the USA. But the "anti-Americanism" of the Chinese foreign policy has lost its anti-imperialist content. It has become a mere "revolutionary" phrase and is characterized by purely nationalistic features. Other "anti-imperialist" statements or actions by the Chinese leaders only serve to promote their great-power policy.

The Peking leadership is trying to camouflage its pro-imperialist course, notably by showing special respect for the "medium-sized and small countries"—the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even by posing as a "developing country" that is rendering "disinterested" aid.

The Maoist foreign policy is characterized by an extremism owing to its hostility to a relaxation of tension and to its aggressive nature. Thus Peking's foreign-policy course does damage to the struggle for peaceful coexistence, for improving the international climate.

There are today, however, strong factors counteracting this course and the Peking leaders' collusion with the imperialist states. These are, first of all, the strength of the socialist community and the growing might of the USSR, which reduce the scope of the Maoist leaders' activities. Despite its anti-imperialist camouflage Peking's foreign policy is losing its impact on the national-liberation struggle as a result of Peking's collusion with the leading imperialist powers. There are also other countervailing factors such as the opposition between Maoism and genuine progress, the deep contradiction between Peking's anti-socialist course on the

one hand and the objective demands of social development of the country and the aspirations and interests of the working people of China on the other. The inability of the Maoist leaders to draw up a constructive domestic and foreign-policy programme for the country is giving rise to differences even within the Maoist clique.

All these factors, and above all the further strengthening of the socialist community and the successful implementation of the Peace Programme of the 24th CPSU Congress, will, in the final end, lead to the collapse of the current Chinese leaders' foreign-policy course.

Einheit, 1973, No. 6, Abridged

The First Stage

Yuri ZHUKOV

The results of the first stage of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are being studied with care throughout the world. In accordance with an understanding reached earlier, the first stage was held (early in July, 1973) at the level of foreign ministers in Helsinki. It is being noted everywhere that this, truly unprecedented, high-level meeting of 33 European states, the USA and Canada took place in a businesslike, constructive atmosphere.

The second stage of the conference will begin in Geneva; the coordinating committee will start work on August 29 and the various commissions on September 18. They will review the agenda and prepare drafts that will be acceptable to all, of the final documents, which will be approved at the third stage of the conference.

In view of the positive results of the first stage of the conference that has just concluded in Helsinki, which, together with the recommendations prepared during the preliminary consultations, have laid a solid foundation for further work, the Soviet Union, as well as a number of other states, takes the view that the remaining stages of the conference should be held without undue delay.

CLEAR, NOBLE AIMS

The reports from Helsinki during the first stage of the conference evoked a feeling of satisfaction among peace-loving people everywhere. They had yet another proof that important and positive changes are taking place in Europe—a turn from the cold war and a state of dangerous tension to praiseworthy joint efforts to strengthen peace and promote mutually advantageous cooperation.

These changes are above all the outcome of the combined efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which have found understanding among the realistic-minded leaders of West European states.

“We call for efforts to overcome Europe’s tragic past, not in order to forget it, but in order that it may never be repeated,” said Leonid Brezhnev in a speech on May 1, 1973, in Red Square. “This is a completely realistic task now that socialism has become a powerful, invincible force in Europe.

“Our aims are clear, constructive and noble. They are worthy of the Leninist Party, of the world’s first country of victorious socialism. Lenin’s idea of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is winning ever new victories in the minds of people and in the practice of international relations.”

The outstanding successes in the struggle for the strengthening of peace and security, achieved under the banner of the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th Congress of our Party, are a clear confirmation of this.

Important landmarks on this road were the visit of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee L. I. Brezhnev to France, during which the Principles of Cooperation Between the USSR and

France were elaborated and signed; the Soviet-US summit talks in Moscow, marked by the adoption of the Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the USSR and the USA; the visit of Leonid Brezhnev to the FRG, which signified a new important contribution to the strengthening of peace; the visit of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to the USA and his talks with President Richard Nixon, which led to the signing of highly important agreements, including the all-important agreement on the prevention of nuclear war; and the two working meetings between Leonid Brezhnev and French President Georges Pompidou, which confirmed the importance of Franco-Soviet cooperation in European affairs.

As a result of these developments, international relations, as the foreign ministers of many countries pointed out in their speeches at the conference in Helsinki, are now entering a new stage. Only recently the cold war formed the general background of the international situation, but now the picture has changed. Experience shows what our Party has repeatedly stated in the past, notably at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers’ Parties in Moscow in June 1969, namely, that peaceful coexistence does not merely mean the absence of war between socialist and capitalist states. Observance of the principle of peaceful coexistence opens up broader possibilities for the development of relations between them. This means the settlement of international issues by negotiation, concerted measures to reduce the danger of war, the relaxation of international tension, and mutually advantageous economic, trade, scientific, technical and cultural ties.

Such are the principled positions to which the

Soviet Union and other European socialist countries adhered while working in the course of many years for the convocation of the all-European conference, and which they adhered to at this conference.

It should be noted that the favourable international atmosphere which had prevailed as a result of this struggle had a beneficial impact on the work of this conference, too.

MAIN PROBLEMS

It is being pointed out in the world press that the USSR and other socialist countries did not limit themselves to a statement concerning their general conception of European security and cooperation, but submitted draft resolutions on all the points of the agenda. These drafts take into account the ideas contained in the recommendations which were prepared by the representatives of 34 states during their consultations in Helsinki, and the positions stated at bilateral meetings. Thus, the wishes of other countries have been taken into consideration in the drafts submitted by the socialist countries.

It is generally agreed that the main and basic document is the draft submitted by the Soviet Union of a General Declaration on the Fundamentals of European Security and the Principles of Relations Between States in Europe.

The progressive world public correctly regards as principles of paramount importance the points in this document concerning the sovereign equality of the participating states; their renunciation of the use or threat of force; that they regard the existing frontiers in Europe as inviolable now and in the future, that they will present no territorial

claims upon one another, and that they recognize that peace in this area can be preserved only when no state violates the present-day frontiers; that the participating states will respect and strictly observe the territorial integrity of all states in Europe in their present boundaries; the peaceful settlement of disputes; non-interference in internal affairs; respect for human rights and basic freedoms; equality and the right of nations to shape their own destinies; cooperation between states; and strict observance of commitments under international law.

As Andrei Gromyko, USSR Minister for Foreign Affairs, pointed out in his speech at the conference, it is not on vacant land that the edifice of Europe is being erected. It is being built in a situation that has shaped up in Europe as a result of the Second World War and the post-war development. That is why the Soviet Union has always held, and still holds, that this edifice can be built only on the basis of the general recognition of the existing territorial and political realities, and respect for them.

This viewpoint was supported by many participants in the conference, in particular, by Michel Jobert, Minister of Foreign Affairs of France. "As realists," he said, "we shall take into consideration all the existing realities in the Europe of 1973." Above all, he called for the recognition of the existence of states and their present borders and also the existence of such treaties as those signed by the Federal Republic of Germany with the Soviet Union, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic.

The newspaper *l'Humanité* said that many foreign ministers at Helsinki welcomed the document submitted by the Soviet Union, regarding it as a

Magna Charta defining the principles of relations between European states and capable of ensuring security on the continent.

Naturally, there were different attitudes to these proposals, since the states attending the conference belong to different social systems. Different viewpoints were expressed, and emphasis was put on different things. It is clear, therefore, that much effort is still needed to work out formulas acceptable to all parties, and to draw up a single document, which, as the Polish newspaper *Głos Pracy* put it, will be a "new code of coexistence."

But a start has been made, and it is a good one.

Also of great importance are the other documents submitted by the socialist countries, namely, the draft of a joint statement on the promotion of cooperation in the field of economics, of trade, of science and technology, and of the environment, prepared by the German Democratic Republic and Hungary; the draft, submitted by Poland and Bulgaria, of a document about the main lines of development of cultural cooperation, contacts and information exchange; and the draft document submitted by Czechoslovakia on the establishing of a Consultative Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The representatives of other participant states in the conference also submitted proposals concerning the items on the agenda.

In outlining the positions of their respective governments, the foreign ministers of 35 participant states laid a good, sound foundation for work in the future. No wonder that even such a newspaper as *Le Figaro*, which had on more than one occasion expressed doubts about the idea of European cooperation, has considered it possible to make the following comment: "The Helsinki conference gives rise to hope. . . It is amazing how much satis-

faction the European conference on security and cooperation has evoked among the public in most of the countries that took part in it. . . Helsinki will mark the beginning of a new era. Confidence in a peaceful morrow is being confirmed already now at the conference."

However, for the sake of objectiveness, we cannot ignore certain discordant notes in the general optimistic evaluation of the results of the first phase of the conference. Certain politicians, who owe their success to the cold war and who feel uneasy in the new situation, still cling to their old tactics, question the sincerity of the socialist countries, and try to frighten people with the "Soviet menace" bogey. Some of these politicians even repeat Dulles's calls to "roll back" communism.

These same politicians also extol the conduct of the Peking leaders, who have adopted a frankly hostile attitude towards the European conference on security and cooperation.

All this probably need not have been mentioned were it not for the generally recognized fact that statements of this kind reflect the sentiments of certain quarters. It means that there are still forces which are going against the tide.

But the attempts to hinder the efforts to create healthier atmosphere in international relations will end in failure. This is evidenced by the entire course of world developments in the last few years. Sober-minded politicians in the West cannot fail to realize this.

"We must make detente permanent," said W. Scheel, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, in his speech at the conference. "We must see to it that not a single contradiction between individual participant states,

There is still a great deal to be done. What has already been accomplished does not guarantee that the way to a successful outcome of the conference will be smooth. But it does instill confidence in ultimate success. Bearing this in mind, the world peace-loving public will contribute in every possible way to the successful conclusion of the work of the conference.

ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ
И ПРОЦЕССЫ ПЕКИНА
на английском языке
Цена 13 коп

[illegible]